

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 2100**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

|                  |  |  |
|------------------|--|--|
| Applicant:       | K. Peltonen et al.   | Attorney Docket No.: MSFT122348        |
| Application No.: | 10/775,749   | Art Unit: 2168 / Confirmation No: 8729 |
| Filed:           | February 10, 2004  | Examiner: Olubusola Oni                |
| Title:           | SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR FACILITATING FULL TEXT<br>SEARCHING UTILIZING INVERTED KEYWORD INDICES |  |

RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Seattle, Washington 98101

October 3, 2007

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-31 are pending in the present application. In the May 3, 2007, Office Action (herein "Office Action"), Claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-31 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), second paragraph, as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0060304 to Parikh Prashant (hereinafter "Prashant 2"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

U. S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0060304 to Parikh

As mentioned above, the Office Action asserts that Prashant 2 teaches the present invention. However, Prashant 2 has a filing date of September 4, 2004, which was after the filing date of the present invention, February 10, 2004. While Prashant 2 is a continuation of U.S. Patent No. 7, 231, 379 to Parikh Prashant (hereinafter "Prashant 1"), careful review of these references reveals that Prashant 2 contains portions that were not present in Prashant 1. The Office Action relies on several of these new portions in making the rejection of Claim 1. Specifically, the following sections in Prashant 2, cited by the Office Action, are not entitled to the priority date of Prashant 1: paragraph 0032 and paragraph 0250.

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

Because the above-referenced sections of Prashant 2 are not supported by Prashant 1, they are not entitled to a priority date earlier than September 4, 2004. Accordingly, because the above-referenced sections of Prashant 2 were filed following the filing of the present application, these sections are not prior art with regard to the present application. For these reasons, the rejection of the claims of the present application will be addressed without reference to the sections of Prashant 2 that are not prior art with regard to the present application.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-31

Claim 1 recites as follows:

1. A method for facilitating full text searching of a set of data, the method comprising:
  - obtaining keyword data corresponding to a set of data;
  - generating an inverted keyword index and an inverted keyword attribute index corresponding to the keyword data;
  - storing the inverted keyword index and the inverted keyword attribute index in a shared process memory;
  - obtaining a keyword query from a first process; and
  - processing the keyword query from the inverted keyword index in a shared memory.

The Office Action states that Paragraph 0032 of Prashant 2 either directly teaches or suggests "obtaining keyword data corresponding to a set of data," "storing the inverted keyword index and the inverted keyword attribute index in a shared process memory," "obtaining a keyword query from a first process," and "processing the keyword query from the inverted keyword index in a shared memory." However, this paragraph of Prashant 2 is a new portion that was not disclosed in Prashant 1. In addition, the Office Action also cites Paragraph 0250 of Prashant 2 as a basis for rejection of Claim 1. Paragraph 0250 was also not present in Prashant 1. As mentioned above, the cited sections of Prashant 2 are not properly considered prior art to the present application. Applicants respectfully suggest that the remaining cited

sections of Prashant 2 fail to teach the elements of Claim 1. Thus, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of Claim 1 and allowance of the Claims.

Independent Claims 11 and 23 recite, in relevant portions, substantially the same features discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Therefore, independent Claims 11 and 23 are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) rejections of Claims 11 and 23 also be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Claims 2-3, 5-10, 12-21, and 22-31 depend from Claims 1, 11, and 23, respectively, and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to Claims 1, 11, and 23.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR  
JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>



Maria L. Culic Anderson  
Registration No. 40,574  
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1714

MAU/MLR:tmm/sbk

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100